THEOLOGY

VOL. L DECEMBER, 1947 No. 330

The Episcopal Church in Scotland

WHEN Boswell was incautious enough to make a disparaging remark about the Episcopal Church in Scotland, he laid himself open to a retort that has lost but little of its force in a century and three-quarters.[1] Much history lies behind that conversation at Montrose in August, 1773, and to understand it is to understand something of one of the most pathetic chapters in Anglican history.

The Episcopal Church in Scotland is a tiny minority. She numbers some 110,000 (55,000 communicants) out of a population of over three million; she has just over three hundred clergymen in her service, and four hundred places of worship, including private chapels and missions. Of the seven dioceses the two most northern, comprising eight counties and parts of two others, have between them only thirty-three charges staffed by resident priests.[2] Apart from some enclaves in the country districts of the north-east the Church is to be found in strength only in and around the great cities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Dundee. But her smallness is not always obvious, nor is it the most important fact about her. She preserves the framework of a parochial organization with as much of the customary Anglican set-up of parochial machinery as is practicable. Her central and diocesan bureaucratic organization is of the kind familiar in England, and works with a smooth efficiency. The ordinary member of the Church of England who finds himself in Scotland, and (unlike some of his ecclesiastical superiors) resists the natural pull of gravitation towards the (Presbyterian) parish kirk on Sunday morning finds himself in a fairly familiar atmosphere. Mattins at 11 o'clock in Edinburgh Cathedral, for example, is as well attended and is executed with as much formal precision as in most English cathedrals; and, unless he is very lucky in his home parish, the visitor will not be startled at the size of the congregation at an early celebration in a country church. He will even find, in some places, the religious orders he has known in England doing their unspectacular and magnificent work. (He will not be long in Scotland before he hears of the much-frequented retreat house at Walkerburn in Peebles-shire, cared for by the sisters of the Society of St Peter.) It is only after he has lived in Scotland for a while, that the novel and portentous fact is borne home to him that he is one of a minority and, what is

[1] *The Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson.* Ev. ed. p. 51. "Dr Johnson gave a shilling extraordinary to the clerk, saying 'He belongs to an honest church.' I put him in mind, that episcopals were but *dissenters* here; they were only *tolerated.* 'Sir, (said he), we are here, as Christians in Turkey.'"

[2] Statistics may be found in the *Scottish Episcopal Church Year Book* and in the annual *Report* of the Representative Church Council, both obtainable from the R.C.C. Office, 13, Drumsheugh Gardens, Edinburgh, 3.

more, of a dissenting minority. The situation is unlike that anywher
else in the Anglican communion. Here in Scotland there is an establishe
Church, highly conscious of the social prestige and national responsi
bilities of Establishment, recently strengthened by the healing of he
schism with the other major Presbyterian body, bulking big in th
public eye, entrenched in the universities (and practically monopolizin
the faculties of divinity), with a great tradition of scholarship and
complex organization, holding in her possession practically ever
ancient church building which has survived, claiming, with the Fre
Church, the vast majority of the population as her children, and makin
as emotionally evocative an appeal to their hearts as ever the Churc
of England has done to the English people. Overshadowed by he
mighty neighbour, with no ties save those of personal friendship t
counteract the divisive effects of a different theological tradition,
different ecclesiastical polity, a different ethos of piety and the stil
vivid memories of a troubled history, the Episcopal Church is
strangely isolated little body. Her position would be so much simple
and more intelligible to her countrymen and to others if she coul
regard herself—as they mostly regard and describe her—as "th
English Church," the local branch of the Church of England,
missionary off-shoot from Canterbury, existing for the benefit o
English visitors and for those few Anglicized Scots who like thei
services higher than the traditional diet of worship provided by th
Kirk. But the problem of the Episcopal Church is not merely tha
she is small; nor merely that she is a sect; but that she has a histor
which refuses her to allow herself to acquiesce in her sectarian status
It is that history which explains, justifies and ennobles her existence.

There is no space here in which to attempt to unravel the tangle
story of Scottish ecclesiastical affairs; but certain points must b
recalled unless the present is to remain wholly unintelligible. It wa
by no means obvious in the period between the restoration of episcopac
in 1610 and the refusal of the bishops to take the oaths in 1690, i
spite of the upheaval of the middle years of the century, that the whol
country was unitedly Presbyterian in belief and sympathy; nor was i
so obvious in 1690 as it was to the Whig historians of a later perio
that the Stuart cause to which the bishops committed themselves wa
hopelessly lost; still less was it obviously in the interests of the natio
that it should be abandoned. In other words it was not inevitable
even at the end of the seventeenth century, that Scotland should b
Presbyterian and Calvinist any more than it was inevitable in 155
that England should be Episcopalian and Anglican. The Presbyterian
finally triumphed because the State supported them, and Episcopalian
declined under the combined influences of a propaganda whic
identified prelacy with tyranny and the presbytery with liberty
of the slow, grinding pressure of the penal laws enforced after th
'15 and the '45, of their own internal dissensions and of the degeneratio
of their once reasonable political faith into an obstinate romanticism
The historical evidence suggests that there is at least a *prima facie* cas
for the Episcopalian claim, maintained to-day as strongly as ever, tha
the established Church owes her power and the Episcopal Church he

weakness not to the fact that the one represents the true development of Scottish religion and the other an exotic aberration from the Scottish norm, but to the fortune of politics. It might have been otherwise. Hence, for an understanding of the mind of Scottish Episcopalianism to-day it is essential to grasp not only that this Church has the status of a sect, but also that she refuses, on reasoned historical grounds, to acquiesce in that status.[1]

Since her revival in the middle years of the last century the Scottish Episcopal Church has possessed a very vivid sense of unity and cohesion. She has, of course, had her internal controversies, but they have mostly been about policy and procedure, and to-day she lives, thinks and acts as a united body. As in England, it is the established Church which provides a home for the nominal Christian. To call oneself an Episcopalian means something, and it means much the same thing for everyone. There are the familiar varieties of high and low churchmanship, but no real party divisions. The very smallness of the Church would make them suicidal, but there are other reasons for their non-existence. Organized Evangelicalism evoked very little response from the Scottish Church in the early nineteenth century, and had to be content with securing a foothold in the few proprietary chapels (now mostly disappeared) whence it could infiltrate the Establishment; the disciples of the Oxford movement came to Scotland to learn as much as to teach; and modernism of the militant party kind has never had any appreciable effect. The long-standing interest in liturgy, and the traditional toleration of the practice of reservation of the eucharistic elements saved Scotland from many of the disputes which troubled the Church of England (though not from one first-class controversy over eucharistic doctrine in the celebrated case of Bishop Forbes); the freedom from parliamentary control has enabled the Scottish Church to work out a system of government which is genuinely constitutional. The laity has a voice in the election of bishops, and the clergy a very full share in the ordering of the Church's affairs. Over a long period a workable code of canons has been hammered out, and the machinery exists for their enforcement and revision.[2] Both the canons and the Prayer Book were last revised in 1929, in an atmosphere refreshingly different from the heats and alarums of Prayer Book revision in England. For a considerable time the episcopal bench has been a homogeneous body, capable of speaking with one voice and of offering a united leadership. Allowing for the wholesome "tensions" which seem to belong to the very nature of Anglicanism, the Scottish Church possesses a very considerable amount of unity in thought and outlook.

But a sect is always in danger of being pre-occupied with its own concerns, and of displaying either a nervous self-consciousness or a self-complacent superiority. In order to see how far the Episcopal Church has succeeded in resisting the temptations of sectarianism it is pertinent to ask three questions:

[1] L. Pullan, *Religion since the Reformation* (1923), pp. 149-155; and W. Stephen, *History of the Scottish Church* (1896) vol. ii, pp. 417 *ff.* and the sources there quoted.
[2] *Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1929.

(1) Is Anglicanism in Scotland fulfilling its traditional function o attempting to mediate between the Churches of the Reformation and "the old religion"?

(2) How far is the Episcopal Church maintaining, illuminating and enriching the Anglican tradition?

(3) Does she make any real impact on the life of the nation, apar from the faithful discharge of her routine pastoral duties?

The answer to the first question resolves itself into a discussion o the relations of the Episcopal Church with established Presbyterianism The Roman Catholic Church, four times as numerous as the Episcopal with a strong minority of hereditary Scottish members and a militan Irish section, is as intransigent as ever, and shows no more sign i Scotland than anywhere else of welcoming the activities of Anglica bridge builders. She is a powerful influence in civic life, especially i the west. The relations of the Episcopal and Presbyterian bodie vary much from district to district. In Glasgow, for example, the are friendly; elsewhere they can sometimes be described only as a armed neutrality (with every now and then the excitement of a borde incident) mitigated by a certain amount of fraternization. Th General Assembly of the Church of Scotland has politely declined t take episcopacy into its system; and the established Church ca hardly be said to go out of her way—officially—to further the cause re-union. She is very conscious of her status as the national Churc and finds it difficult to regard her Church Order as a serious bar t communion with the Church of England. Her difficulty is increase by the readiness with which broad-minded dignitaries of the Church England and the less wary of the Service chaplains accept invitatio to preach in her pulpits; but it is arguable that the exaggerate importance she appears to attach to these occurrences betrays a uneasy conscience and perhaps an inferiority complex. There a signs that some of her members (and not only the younger one are aware of the deficiencies of Scottish Presbyterianism. Probab the most acutely felt need is for the recovery of some measure liturgical worship, and for the linking of that worship with the proble of workaday life. Anglicanism, with its traditional understanding the central importance of the liturgy, and Scottish Episcopalianis with its great record of liturgical scholarship and achievement, oug to find here a point of contact with Presbyterianism. Episcopalians m perhaps be pardoned for feeling a certain ironic detachment from t enthusiasms of the sons whose fathers stoned the prophets; but this i surgent interest in liturgy among the ranks of the least liturgical of the major Christian bodies does deserve more encouragement and he than Episcopalians are apparently either able or willing to give. T reason for this failure carries us to the very heart of the Presbyteria Episcopalian difficulty. The Presbyterian monopoly of the theologi faculties in the universities has had two very serious results: first, th the clergymen of the Episcopal Church do not speak the same the logical language as their Presbyterian colleagues (very few of them ta a theological degree at a Scottish university; those who do, norma take it externally and so do not attend the lectures of Presbyteri

eologians); second, that the Episcopal Church herself is imperfectly rnished for theological debate. She has her scholars among her shops and priests, and she has a well-endowed theological college in dinburgh. But her ministers are all busy men, and the staff of the llege has its hands full with preparing men for ordination. The rimary need of the Scottish Church is, I am convinced, a strong body students and teachers able to command the respect of the scholars the established Church, to use fruitfully all opportunities of contact th Presbyterianism, and to help the ordinary parish priest to read d think theologically. Among the objects of this body would be e study of Scottish ecclesiastical history in a rigorously scientific spirit r it is in this peculiarly complicated and controversial history that e roots of differences lie, and its writing is still largely in the hands of opagandists); the study of liturgy and of its place in the life of the urch (thus maintaining a worthy Scottish tradition and affording a int of contact with Presbyterian needs); the study of the meaning of iscopacy (for the Scottish Church after all owes her separate and ntinued existence to the doctrine of apostolic succession); and the ploration of those fundamental doctrines of God and man about ich the classical Calvinism and the main Anglican tradition are not agreement. Here seems to lie the eirenic task of Scottish Episcolianism, rather than in an occasional well-advertised exchange of achers or in the cultured amenities of the Leighton clubs.[1] But task may be beyond its resources if not beyond its interest.

The second question has been partly answered already by implication. At the moment there is very little strictly theological activity scernible, and hardly anything that can be called a trend of thought. ne clergy depends on English scholarship for its theological reading, d the most competent theologians are men of sound learning ther than original thought or literary skill. The greatest contribution ich the Episcopal Church can make to the Anglican tradition is her alty to a doctrine and a fact—to the theological importance of urch order, and to her own present possession of a constitutional iscopacy.[2] It is these things alone which have, at certain periods in tory, justified her continued separation from Presbyterianism; it is se, more than anything else, which place a question mark against propriety of some recent attempts at *rapprochement* between the ter Establishments of England and Scotland; and she therefore ces upon the attention of the whole Anglican communion their imrtance. Her critics say that they have become an obsession with her. t if belief in a doctrine of apostolic succession *is* part of the Anglican dition (and a reading of the preface to the ordinal in the Book of mmon Prayer suggests that it is), then Anglicans who still believe in ir tradition will not be sorry to see Anglicans who don't embarrassed the stubborn fidelity of the Scottish Church to this part of it.

[1] The Leighton Clubs are discussion groups of Presbyterians and Episcopalians, med after the great seventeenth-century Archbishop. I do not wish to deny their lfulness.

[2] Cf. *The Scottish Episcopal Church and Re-union*, the Bishop of Glasgow's Charge to Diocesan Synod, 1943. (Printed by David Winter and Son, 15, Shore Terrace, ndee.)

Finally, what impact does the Scottish Church make on the natio life? Her critics in England (whose acquaintance with her is perha made in the intervals of holidaying in the Highlands) accuse her aloofness, even of escapism. Her publicity is bad,[1] and insufficie justice is done to her very real sense of national responsibility, and her efforts to quicken and direct the social conscience. Her individu members, cleric and lay, take their part in the national life—a pa be it remembered, not made for them by office or tradition, a sometimes, where old memories and prejudices linger, denied them s (a teacher in a Church school can still be debarred from promotion a State school; local politics can still be swayed by religious c siderations); the Home Mission Crusade is an effort to raise mo for new church buildings with the aim of converting the people of towns who own no practical ecclesiastical allegiance as well as mir tering to church folk; the Social Service Board does a remarka amount of welfare work in very varied ways, sponsoring not o moral welfare in its technical sense, but also work amongst the fish folk of the coastal districts, the old (the new "eventide" homes), a the young. A Church which has thought it worth while for many ye to conduct a special mission to the wandering tinkers of the Highla districts, neglected by others, has not entirely lost its sense of so vocation. In Glasgow recently six Episcopalian clergymen, includ the Bishop, have sat on an inter-denominational committee which explored "the measure of our common agreement in the Christ Faith and its application to everyday life," and have subscribed report.[2] Ever since the Seabury episode, which has given her a nota link with the American Church, she has been concerned for missionary work of the Church, and to-day she is wholly respons for missions in Central India (Chanda) and partially responsible work in South Africa (St John's, Kaffraria). If Scottish national ever becomes a dominant issue in Scottish politics the Episc Church might have a new and useful function to fulfil; for, in strength of her sense for Scottish history and of her contacts wit wider world than Scotland, she might, with wise statesmanship her leaders, act as a valuable mediating and moderating force.

Perhaps in no country has Anglicanism so hard a task; nowhe the middle way so narrow and so hard. Yet once already the Episc Church in Scotland has deserved the gratitude of Anglicans, by serving for a forgetful generation the theology of their fathers; signs are not lacking that she may once again be called upo fulfil the same task. If she can do more than this, and act as an i grating and revivifying force in the land where the Reformation some of its greatest triumphs and wrought its worst havoc, and it by virtue of her dual loyalty to the Reformation and to a Christen older and wiser than that of the Reformed Churches, she will h fulfilled her most glorious vocation.

R. CAN

[1] Perhaps the newly projected *Association of Friends of the Episcopal Church in Sco* will remedy this.

[2] *The Christian Front in Glasgow* (Craig Wilson, 70, Bath Street, Glasgow, published in 1945.

A London Christian of Tudor Times

. . everyone that is of the Truth heareth My voice.—John xviii, 37.[1]

In the year 1537 Sir Justinian Champneys (sometimes referred to Sir John Champneys in Stow's Survey) being then Lord Mayor of ondon, bought himself a country estate, to wit, Hall Place, Bexley, the County of Kent. He rebuilt the house, and made it a really autiful Tudor mansion, and there, with later additions, it stands to is day. The time was one when many estates were changing hands. vil conflict, following disastrously upon a long period of war with ance, had greatly impoverished, and even destroyed the old milies, and a class of new rich was coming into existence, just as it d after Waterloo, and again after 1918.

But it was not only Lord Mayors who moved out into the country. ss eminent but in their degree equally prosperous citizens of London llowed their example, and took to themselves houses in the home unties. Thus it is that about the year 1680 a branch of the Stow mily of Cornhill are found to have established themselves at Farn-rough, near Bromley, in Kent. They were not lineal descendants of man whom we commemorate to-day, for he left no male heirs—ly daughters; but they seem to have been cousins. Farnborough Hall s not their freehold, but they leased it from the Hart Dykes of llingstone Castle near Eynsford, to whose estate it was an appen-ge; and there they flourished until the early years of the nineteenth tury. Thomas Stow of Farnborough Hall was my maternal grand-her, and it is thus as performing a simple act of filial piety that I nd here to-day.

The Stows of Farnborough always kept in esteem the memory of ir distinguished forbear, and one of my earliest recollections as a all boy is of my grandmother taking me aside and telling me about illustrious historian of the City of London, and exhorting me to intain a tradition of sound learning. When therefore one entered inity College, Cambridge, to read history, it seemed the right thing be doing.

These Kentish Stows lived on the whole a quiet and undistinguished, ough not inglorious life. They were almost invariably church-rdens; they farmed their land well; and one of them at least was a gistrate, and was concerned in an episode which John Stow would ve liked to record, and which would have made a tolerable film in se days. The Hastings coach was on a certain occasion stopped by highwayman on the slopes of the old road at the back of the parish urch at Farnborough. But the criminal was somehow interrupted. fled, throwing away his pistol, which fell on my great-grandfather's d, and the Stow of that generation, being a local justice of the peace, sed the hue and cry, and pursued him on horseback, thundering ough Bromley and the pleasant village of Lewisham, and arrested

[1] An address delivered before the Bishop of Kensington and the Lord Mayor and riffs, in the Church of St Andrew Undershaft, on the occasion of the annual Stow mmemoration, May 30, 1947.

his man in somewhat dramatic style at a wayside tavern in Greenwic
The discarded weapon was a familiar object to me in the days of n
youth, hanging in the dining room of my uncle, William Stow; a
it is still, so far as I know, in the possession of my cousin, Major Rog
Stow, who served in the Dover garrison during the recent war, and
I am sorry to say, the last of his line.

I have, however, a second reason for being glad to stand here to-da
and that is to be able to pay a debt of gratitude to the City. In t
year 1685, my father's family, together with a number of oth
Huguenot refugees, fled from the cruelty and intolerance of t
government then in power across the channel. The story of t
ultimate cause which led to their migration from Loudun in Poit
is told with poignancy and lurid detail in the pages of Alfred de Vigr
They were received here in London with kindness and hospitality
one of your predecessors, my Lord Mayor, and were enabled to set
in the neighbourhood of Smithfield, to become members of the Wallo
Church in Threadneedle Street, to send their sons to Westmins
School, and finally to enter the service of the (then newly establishe
Bank of England, as some of its officials. Since that time until n
there has never ceased to be a Bouquet at the Bank, in some capac
or other. It would not be right then to come here to-day withou
word of thanks and recognition to the representatives of that gr
City which I have known and loved all my life, and to one of the ve
oldest schools of which, that of St Dunstan in the East,[1] I owe my ea
training.

And now it is high time for the parson to turn to his text. I wi
as seems fitting, to speak to you to-day about *John Stow as a Christi*

I

Let us first of all note that he was the heir of a very long and v
good Christian *tradition*. His father, grandfather and great-grandfath
all called Thomas, were all of them members of the congregation
St Michael's, Cornhill, and kept the church duly supplied w
lamp oil and with candles. Thomas the grandfather was in 15
Master of the Tallowchandlers' Company. Mr Kingsford dra
attention to the fact that an earlier Thomas Stow had been Dean
St Paul's and Archdeacon of Bedford in the reign of Henry IV, a
Camden records that there was a chantry to this Dean in old St Pa
Cathedral, near the tomb of Earl Beauchamp, and that it had b
founded by John Westyeard, citizen and vintner of London, to p
for the souls of the said Thomas and all his family. The successi
according to Kingsford, may even go further back still, for althou
we are unable to trace the actual connexion, there was a John de Sto
in the city in 1283, a Henry de Stowe, a draper with a lease of
Coldharbour in 1319, another John in 1381, and a William Stow
1387.

The adjacent church of St Peter, Cornhill, was reputed to be

[1] First mentioned in an ordinance of Henry VI, dated 1446, though it is prob
older still.

oldest ecclesiastical foundation in Britain, having been built first, according to Jocelin of Furness, by Thean, the first Archbishop of London, in the reign of the British king Lucius, with the aid of Ciran, his chief butler. This story is of doubtful authenticity, though it is duly recorded by Stow in his survey, for what it is worth. It is, however, to Stow's credit that he will not pass it as established fact, for he appends a note, "Archbishops of London hard to be proved, and therefore not be be affirmed." Still he was always aware of the great antiquity of Christian institutions in his neighbourhood, and this strengthened his sense of continuity.

II

Next, let us say quite frankly, that he had a lively interest in the medieval Church and its doings. Remember, he was born in the middle of the English Reformation, and managed to live through the reigns of four Tudors with his head on his shoulders, dying two years after the accession of the first Stuart. A slight sense of tension between him and his mother, Elizabeth, may have been due to her rather stronger Protestantism. In 1569 he was clearly suspected of being a quisling, for he was found to have in his possession a copy of a manifesto by the Spanish ambassador on behalf of the Duke of Alva, and admitted that he had been indiscreet enough to read it to other persons and to discuss it with them. The Queen's council ordered his library to be searched, and the Bishop of London (Grindal) sent to Cecil a catalogue of "Stowe the taylor his unlawfulle bookes," but the investigators seem to have been rather stupid, for they included in the list Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, which in itself is indicative of Stow's real attitude towards the Church. He was in point of fact a perfectly loyal subject of the Virgin Queen, and was of the same way of thinking as Archbishop Parker, who was a patron of his. Both of them held, as did in our day Bishop Browne of Bristol, that the best way to rebut excessive papal claims was to show what the position of the English Church had been in the golden age of its foundation. It may be remembered that this was the true reason for Parker's rich accumulation (which he made, in the library of Corpus Christi College at Cambridge), of Saxon ecclesiastical MSS. Stow edited some old chronicles for Parker, and the latter evidently trusted his scholarship. He was *not*, as some have thought, a crypto-Papist, but a genuine Elizabethan Anglican, and it is well worth noting that he provides, all unconsciously, a very good picture of the way in which the Elizabethans *did* think of their Church. If we turn to the end of his survey we shall find that he gives two long lists, one of the Mayors of London, the other of the Bishops of London. Both run continuously without a break, and there is no sign that Stow regards Bancroft, who was consecrated in 1597, as less truly a valid bishop than Richard Fitzjames, the last of the really medieval Bishops of London, who, while a fellow of Merton College, Oxford, was consecrated to Rochester in the reign of Henry VI, then translated to Chichester, and finally to London in 1505. For Stow, Bancroft is plainly as much a valid episcopal successor to Fitzjames as

James Pemberton, Mayor in 1602, is a valid civic successor to the Sir William Walworth who arrested Wat Tyler in 1381.

Now what does this mean?—It can only mean that Stow knew and consented to the fact that the Elizabethan Church leaders had every *intention* of maintaining the English Church as a true and continuous development without a break from the pre-Reformation institution, and that they had taken due care to ensure this. There is here no mechanical theory of succession, but a tacit assumption that the authorities of the Church of England *fully intended* to preserve the identity of the body corporate which they faithfully loved, as an organic part of the Church Universal.

Stow does not argue the point, or defend it, as though it were doubtful or disputable. He takes it for granted quite simply, and shows no uneasiness that when he has written (as he does) "so much for the succession of the Bishops of London" someone will rise up and say, "No. Every bishop from Grindal onwards is no bishop, and the Church of England is an entirely newfangled and Protestant creation."

Strange to say, I have never seen this particular *argumentum e silentio* made use of anywhere (*e.g.*, by Bishop Gore in his *Orders and Unity*, or his *Roman Catholic Claims*), yet it is surely worth consideration as evidence, especially as there is no sign of Stow ever having been set up by Parker to defend Anglicanism in the way in which Hooker was deputed to do so by Archbishop Whitgift, though incidentally it is to be remembered that Stow greatly approved of Whitgift, whom he describes as "a man born for the benefit of the country and the good of the Church."

Yet it would be a mistake to think of Stow as a mere *laudator temporis acti*. He was quite ready to record improvements, whether in building, manners, or the disposal of charitable funds. But I think he recognized, as some of us have done in these latter days, that a good deal that was beautiful and good was cast away by the zeal of the reformers, and that the Protestant Reformation, in the hands of those who were worldly and not very pious, became a pretext for a coarse iconoclasm, and an excuse for violence and laxity. It is rather significant that the longest story he tells of any Bishop of London is of Roger Niger (1229) who admonished the moneylenders of his time "to leave such enormities as they tendered the salvation of their souls, and to do penance for that they had committed. But when he saw that they laughed him to scorn and also threatened him, he generally excommunicated and cursed all such, and commanded straitly that such usurers should depart farther from the city of London, which hither towards had been ignorant of such mischief and wickedness, lest his diocese should be infected withal.'

We can less commend our author's interest in alchemy and astrology.[1] But he was the child of his age, and it is worth remembering that even a puritan like Nicholas Culpeper believed in the influence of the stars.

On another line of research, Stow had the distinction of being one of the original members of the Society of Antiquaries, founded in 157-

[1] He was a close friend of Dr John Dee, the celebrated Elizabethan astrologer.

under the patronage of Archbishop Parker, and he contributed to its proceedings a learned note on the origin of sterling money. There seems no doubt that if he had had the opportunity, Stow would have liked to produce the sort of outline of universal history which in later days we have come to associate with the names of Voltaire and H. G. Wells, and we know that he had in preparation a vast work on the foundation of churches in this country, dealt with county by county. It is considered by Kingsford that Dugdale's *Monasticon* is largely built upon the results of this diligent research.

III

In the third place, let us consider the very attractive unworldliness of John Stow. He was admitted to the freedom of the Merchant Taylors' Company in November, 1547, the year Henry VIII died, and the Company valued him so highly that it voted him a pension in 1578, and more than doubled it in 1600, when he was in want. Yet although he might have remained a successful and prosperous tradesman, he not only gave up his business in order to devote himself without interruption for thirty years to his labours as an antiquary and historian, but spent large sums out of his own pocket in making an extensive collection of valuable and important MSS, many of which are now preserved in the British Museum. In doing all this he ran considerable risk, and became much impoverished, and although people declared that they appreciated his work, as so often happens in similar cases, they salved their consciences with easy speeches, and left poor Stow in want. James I took a characteristically economical way of putting him on the Civil List, by giving him and his deputies a royal licence to collect funds for his needs. It produced very little by way of response, and as Wheatley says "was indeed a pitiful reward for the well-directed labours of a life-time." Yet Stow remained undaunted and unsoured, and continued his labours with the aid of financial help from his friend William Camden till his death in his eightieth year. His attitude towards his poverty was not one of gloom, and a story told by Ben Jonson shows that he could jest about it in a truly Franciscan spirit. Jonson says that they were out walking together one day when they encountered two crippled beggars, whereupon Stow asked them what they would have, to take him into their order and fraternity. Actually there is a hint here of his growing weakness, for at the age of seventy-eight he wrote: "My feet, which have borne me many a mile, have of late refused once in four or five months to convey me from my bed to my study."

IV

Closely associated with his unworldliness is his extreme devotion to truth and accuracy, and it is these two qualities taken together which mark the profundity of his Christian character. I am sure that I can do no better than to quote again the well-known passage from the writings of Edmond Howes, Stow's friend and literary executor:

"He was tall of stature, lean of body and face, his eyes small and

crystalline, of a pleasant and cheerful countenance: his sight and memory very good: very sober, mild, and courteous to any that required his instructions: and retained the true use of his senses unto the day of his death, being of an excellent memory. He always protested never to have written anything either for malice, fear, or favour, nor to seek his own particular gain or vainglory: and that his only pains and care was to write truth." . . . "He was very careless of scoffers, backbiters, and detractors. He lived peacefully." This tribute may be taken in conjunction with Stow's own "address to the reader" which appears at the head of his Chronicles and both editions of the Annals: "Though it be written homely, yet is it not, as I trust, written untruly; and in histories the chief thing that is to be desired is truth."

"*Everyone*," said Jesus before Pilate, "*Everyone that is of the Truth heareth My voice. To this end have I been born, and to this end came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the Truth.*"

The age of Elizabeth was not, in general, one of cool and dispassionate writing, or of calm and detached pursuit of facts. Controversy was often heated, and opponents were frequently abusive of one another; even Stow in his dealings with Grafton is not *quite* free from this fault, though he showed anger because he believed that Grafton was crooked. Taken as a whole, however, Stow's work shows him a pioneer in the accurate study of English documentary texts, and as scrupulous as the great Erasmus himself. Let us recall that in 1561 he issued a most careful and critical edition of the text of Chaucer's poems, in 1565 *A Summarie of Englyshe Chronicles*, in 1580 *The Chronicles of England*, and in 1592 *The Annals of England*, of which latter there were five editions in all, three by Stow himself, and two more by Howes. The good wine was kept to the last, and the first edition of his famous *Survey of London*, his ripest work, and the fruit of a very long period of research, did not appear till 1598, when he was over seventy years of age. His second edition appeared in 1603. Wheatley says of him that he was always in search of information at first hand, that nothing of value ever escaped him, and that his arrangement of his materials is admirable.

He displayed, in fact, all the features of the modern scientific historian and investigator, and in these days when political propaganda is so often dishonest, and commercial advertising so full of exaggeration and distortion, we need more than ever to take as our model one who never wrote anything for private ends or vainglory, but only took care to write truth—and that, we may add (in the words of the Psalmist) "though it were to his own hindrance."

Stow, like those of us who live to-day, was set in the midst of so many and great changes, that by reason of human frailty it was not always easy to stand upright. His probity is all the more commendable. He refers with regret to the lamentable increase in "quaffing"—though no puritan, he hated intemperance—and the growth of this is unhappily exemplified by the account given in the records of Sir John Harington, of how at the beginning of the reign of James I, just before the end of Stow's career, King Christian of Denmark came to England to visit his son-in-law, and the whole court, both men and women

including the king and his royal guest, were hopelessly the worse for drink for several days on end, though it is true this was attributed to the bad influence of the Danes! From 1584-5 Stow was employed by the City authorities as a surveyor of ale-houses, a task which he discharged, as we can see from a memorandum, with strictness and judgment. This was shortly before the affair of the Armada, and in 1585 he is recorded as a collector of charges in a city ward for a muster of 4,000 men for the Queen's service. He deplores the laxity in the appointment of jurors and the decline of discipline among the clergy. He has no love of luxury, and on one subject his words have a curiously modern ring. He mentions the importation of a new kind of vehicle from Germany. This was the coach and four—the precursor of the modern motor car. Stow complains that the alarming increase in the quantity of wheeled traffic is causing serious congestion in the narrow streets. The coach seems to have been introduced from Holland in 1554: Howes, expanding Stow, says that it began with the Earl of Rutland in 1555, then the Queen in 1561; and then spread to the nobility and gentry; finally developing into public vehicles called "long waggons," running from town to town, often long distances, with passengers and commodities—evidently the forerunners of the motor coaches of our own day. Stow's comment is "the world runs on wheels with many whose parents were glad to go on foot." He plainly disapproves of the extravagance of private coaches, and Howes reports that he never would use the new invention himself, but walked everywhere.

I have mentioned, for lack of time, only a *few* items in the record of the man whose memory I join with you in honouring to-day.

His books are a rich mine of information about the customs of our forefathers, and they show again and again how very little the spirit and temper of the mass of our citizens have changed. When we read the vivid account of the pageant of the night-watch (which was broadcast by the B.B.C. not many months ago), we feel as though we were reading the story of some great parade of our own Home Guard; and the open-air street-parties, which we associate with the victory celebrations of 1945, were a perfectly well-recognized feature of the social life of London in the days of Elizabeth, and probably were held in just the same way after the defeat of the Armada.

Whether we consider Stow as a Londoner, related to the *civitas terrena*, or as a churchman, related to the *civitas dei*, the famous phrase of St Paul becomes him equally well—"*a citizen of no mean city*."

I like to think that the sound and practical religious tradition which one associates with Stow was perpetuated in his family and its branches. Looking through my grandfather's books which came from Farnborough Hall, I have been struck by the large number, especially of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, which deal with the practice of religion. The divines of the Stuart period are well represented, and I recall that one of my mother's favourite books of devotion was a communicant's manual with large numbers of extracts for meditation drawn from the writings of the same set of theologians.

Let me leave with you a brief reference to the words which appear as a motto at the head of Stow's tomb.

Aut scribenda agere, aut legenda scribere.

They have faced me at the top of the writing pad in my study for many years, and have been not only a continual inspiration, but a persistent judgment upon my own inadequacy. The Englishman is said by his continental cousins in theology to be an incorrigible Pelagian. That is, he is held to believe that one has only to try hard enough to live out one's ideal in order to succeed therein. The belief is I fear a sad delusion. The more one tries in one's own strength, the more one is confronted with failure. I venture to think that if we had been able to interrogate Mr John Stow as to his own private beliefs we should have found that they agreed very well with those of his neighbour and contemporary, Mr Richard Hooker, whose sermons at the Temple Church Stow might have heard if he had been so minded, and that he would have said, in effect, "I can neither act nor write, save only by the grace of God which strengtheneth me."

I will end with some words from Hooker himself, written while he was in London.

" . . . their thoughts are vain who think their watching can preserve the City which God Himself is not willing to keep: and are not theirs as vain, who think that God will keep the City for which they themselves are not careful to watch? . . . Shall we betake ourselves to our ease, and in that sort refer salvation to God's grace as if we had nothing to do with it, because without it we can do nothing? If we teach grace without the necessity of man's labour, we use one error as a nail to drive out another . . . Grace is not given us to abandon labour, but labour required lest our sluggishness should make the grace of God unprofitable . . . Yet what we have and what we shall have is the fruit of His goodness, and not a thing which we can claim by right or title of our own worth. All that we can do to Him cometh far behind the sum of what we owe: all we have from Him is mere bounty. And seeing all that we of ourselves can do is not only nothing but naught; let Him alone have the glory, by whose only grace we have our whole ability, and power of well-doing." Amen.

A. C. Bouquet.

Christianity—Church—Sacrament—III

I pass on to the idea of "*sacrament*," and especially here I will restrict myself to the essential.

Just like the ministry, the sacrament belongs also to the essential and vital elements of the Church, for the salvation in Christ is granted within the Church. I will start from the following thesis, formulated by myself.

"Because the senses and the mind together form the entity of human personality, the approach and the communication of divine life must be perceived by the senses as well as by the mind. At the same time the social character of the Body of Christ—*i.e.*, the community life of the Church, where all are thrown on each other and are responsible

for each other, as belonging to Christ—makes it imperative that the riches of grace disclosed by Christ are *conjointly* experienced. Therefore the sacraments have an individual as well as a social character, a symbolic form for the senses as well as a real spiritual content, an objective signification as well as a subjectively limited effect."

These words are first of all meant to voice the thought that a Church cannot exist without sacraments, that it is then no longer a Church, because practically nothing happens, there is no mediation of salvation. I hope I shall not be misunderstood; I do not say that mediation of salvation outside the sacraments is impossible, but I mean to say that a Church which principally denies this mediation in the sacraments, is bound to deny every other kind of mediation also, because all kind of mediation of spiritual goods is bound to our human structure. I even here reject the appeal to the so-called intuitive knowledge of God or experience of God—call it mystic, if you like—for I also consider our inmost consciousness thoroughly human and creaturely, even if it could be entirely loosened from our senses which are bound to the perceptible and the tangible.

In the above thesis, secondly, I endeavour to say that the sacrament has to make use of the sensible event as if it were a vestment—a theologian here uses the word "vehiculum"—whereas what really takes place is spiritual, godlike.

But there is still something else, for here, you will admit, we also meet with the question of the "ex opere operato," the question: is salvation mediated as soon as the act is performed, merely in virtue of the performance of the act? I should like to answer: yes, if everything takes place really and truly; no, if it takes place in an untrue manner. By this I mean that the expression "ex opere operato" may be considered practically and scientifically worthless, unless mechanism is looked upon as the acme of religiousness. When what is holy becomes a sort of show or play and honest experience of God is not aimed at, there is no salvation but "krima," damnation, as St Paul says in 1 Cor. ii. When "false brethren" under the deceptive mask of a desire for salvation hoodwink others in order to secure God's blessing in this way, God's merciful heart is surely not robbed of blessing, but the Holy Ghost is sinned against. Here I refer to what I have already said about the ministry and the consecration. The consecration of Matthew, performed by ourselves, we do not consider valid because mean deceit was at the back of it; and even if Matthew himself should have been unaware of this deceit, it would make no difference, for there was deception all the same, and both the consecrator and the consecrandus would have been the victims of this deception; neither the one nor the other should in this case have been guilty, but the act which took place between them could never have met with the approval of God, He could never have been bound by it, or, in this particular case, been imposed upon or robbed by it.

Nothing may be mechanical in the sacrament. It kills itself, as soon as this is the case. But where sincerity and veracity are found, where a desire for salvation is the motive, there God's heart is opened even to the poorest creature, and even by the most miserable form.

This last statement is of course said and meant in the sense of principle. It goes without saying that in a church "all things should be done decently and in good order," that a definitely fixed form should bind the minister and the recipient, in order to effect not what these two happen to desire, but "what the Church desires." The Church is the Body of Christ, she orders her ministers to serve with self-sacrificing humility those who seek God. St Augustine already says over and over again: not Peter, not Paul, not therefore the "minister sacramenti," but "Christus est qui baptizat."

In this thesis I further wished to express the thought that the sacraments are actual, real means of grace. It is well known that the theology of the Reformation is by no means unanimous on this point. Our Church expresses its belief that on the ground of Scripture and tradition it cannot for a moment doubt the reality of the sacrament. A sacrament is a symbol, indeed, but a symbol with a real content, not a mere symbol in our sense. I would say it in this way: a mere symbol is of no use to my soul. If the Church of Christ possesses means of grace, they *are real* means of grace, assurances of God that the love of His will wants to envelop us and to permeate us. Nay, it even seems unworthy and misleading for the life of my soul and fatal for the confidence of my belief if I were not allowed to see in a sacrament something more than a sign, a "signum," and if in a sacrament I should receive nothing better than a seal, a "sigillum." By the "sign" I should have to suppose that grace will follow in due time, by the "seal" that it is already there. But what, then, is a sacrament really? What, then, is its real use? And then, is the actual arrival of grace, either before or after, perhaps not a sacrament?

On this ground our Church confesses, *e.g.*, the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. Also here the fundamental thought is this: a sign which is not a real sign of what it means to signify is mere semblance. This, of course, is not the ground on which our belief is founded: that ground we find in Scripture and tradition; and in this respect it is rather significant that not a single word from the first ten centuries testifies anything but the real presence of Christ in the sacrament which shows his death.

There are of course more questions here than I can answer at this moment, but I will comprise a few points as briefly as possible. Our Church believes in the presence of Christ in the elements of bread and wine. These elements remain also there where Christ is present. They are in their simplicity the symbols of material, bodily nourishment just as flesh and blood are the simple expressions for Christ, even much too simple and inaccurate from a physical-scientific point of view. The way in which Christ is present can only be understood in a spiritual, godly way, for to the believer it is a question of Christ Himself—*i.e.*, His eternal life and His everlasting power. The doctrine of transubstantiation should never be mixed up with and mistaken for that of the real presence. The first is a roman scholastic effort to explain the *realis præsentia*, and a poorish effort at that, which is based on the Aristotelian distinction between *substantia* and *accidentia*, even in inanimate objects, a materialistic concoction of the scholastics

hich is something horrible for scientific knowledge. We must always ear in mind that simplicity of expression is the greatest strength nd the most reliable protector of truth; the Church has always ıffered more from speculation than from dogma.

Nor does our Church look upon the Eucharist as a repetition of the *crifice* of the cross. According to the classical word of the Epistle) the Hebrews this sacrifice took place "once for all," and he who nows St Paul knows his decided opinions on the unconditional erfection and sufficiency of the work of Christ. Bliss cannot be ought with masses, neither can God be made to relent by a repetition the sacrifice of his Son. But in the Eucharist the point is the ever-sting validity of the sacrifice of the cross, and this validity is pro-aimed in every celebration of the Eucharist and placed in the present. he Eucharist not only represents this validity to the eye, but realizes in us. It is every believer who in this celebration proclaims the ath of the Lord to himself; it is every believer who partakes of this crifice, for the Lord comes unto him and includes him in His work of conciliation.

But this idea of sacrifice may never stand apart from *communion*; the ucharist is a Supper and the celebration may never be separated from e congregation, because it is a meal of the community, in which "being many, are one bread, for we are all partakers of that one read." Concretely expressed: the celebration of mass may never an act of the priest alone, but can and may only be the act of e "sacerdos adiunctus plebi," or better still of the "plebs adunata cerdoti."

It would be very tempting for me to say something about each of e seven sacraments, but that would carry me too far. I will only say at Old Catholic theology does not attach much value to the word, e name "sacrament"; medieval theology shackled the well-known ven acts by a definition of "sacrament," with the result that theology ways finds it difficult to make it fit the seven of them. It would be far tter if theology tested each of the seven acts, one by one, to ascertain eir proper value and significance and examined the sacral character each separately; there would be no need for a theology which does is to speak any longer about "the two sacraments" and "those five, mmonly called sacraments."

One final remark. A mistake which has repeatedly been made all ng the line of theology concerns the idea of "sacramental grace." ıe heritage of scholasticism here weighs equally heavy on catholics d on reformers. Earlier theology cut up the idea of grace, broke it to vers and sorted it out and thus really lowered it to a series of obscure ces, emanating from God without being God Himself. This is not doctrine of grace of the ancient Church. Though Scripture aks of the "manifold" grace of God, it still remains *one* grace and an assortment of graces. Let theology take its cue anew from Augustine, who characterized "gratia" as being the expression, the elation, the operation of God's loving will, which comes to us in rist, forgiving, healing, restoring and conquering. It is always God mself, who in the sacrament gives Himself to us. Grace is God's

will in Christ, the very life of God Himself—it is the Holy Ghos working in us.

I am quite convinced, that to many I do not tell anything that is ne and that probably there will not be much contradiction. This woul be a further proof that our Churches are based on the same Ol Catholic ground. But also with regard to other Churches I dare t face the thought that, surely, there is much that seemingly separat them, but that in reality there is much more danger in theologic short-sightedness which obstructs the view and blinds itself by gazin at outward forms we have grown out of, and at structures of theologic thoughts that lack the simplicity of truth. I am convinced th theology on all sides has to revert to the simplicity of apostolic traditio and of apostolic testimony, and that the Churches should be led by t principle of loving, mutual appreciation, which is rooted in the co viction that they seek Christ and no other, for only in Him there salvation.

✠Andreas Rinkel,
Archiepiscopus Ultraiectensis.

(*Concluded*)

Christian Reality in "Macbeth"

There is, I feel, a particular timeliness in now adverting to t Christianity reflected in the Shakespearian drama. Indisputably t world is forsaking the Christian faith more and more. To profess belief in sin and in the Cross now appears to a majority of peop fantastic. They prefer an attitude of hopeful expediency which th regard as enlightened, or else they are content with a confidence progress derived illusorily from the popularization and distortion natural science. Rather than come to grips with the realities whi make of religion a human need, they take refuge in *hubris*, frivolit or despair. The world is sick, because its leaders in every sphe neither admit nor diagnose the causes and gravity of the disease. Si judgment, and grace are denied absolute truth; meekness and char are denied absolute value. The voice of the heart has been silenced the assertiveness of the analytic understanding. Its promptings ha been supplanted by those of an unregarding appetite for wor success.

Shakespeare wrote at a time when the prevailing mental climate w entirely other. Stoicism had no doubt been revived by the Rena sance. Machiavelli had laid bare the cruel facts confronting ruthl political ambition. Montaigne had raised his desperate dou regarding man's stability. The canker of the modern world was alrea at work. And all this the Shakespearian drama duly reflects. But the same time Christianity was still supreme, and spiritual strug was still in the minds of ordinary men and women a vital reality. Th that impalpable world, whose very existence is now largely ignor is the scene of much of the plays. Sin, judgment, grace, and redempt were facts of life, and they are incorporated in the very texture

akespeare's development of his plots. I am not saying that he liberately wrote religious dramas. He was certainly a playwright, t a theologian or philosopher. But he used as subject-matter what : contemporaries knew about and could understand. They would inctively recognize that *Macbeth*, for instance, is a drama of spiritual life. Moreover, if we take *Macbeth* as our example and try to adopt their int of view, so that we see the action somewhat as they saw it, we cover that the protagonist is in his way a forerunner of Western an in our own generation. Shakespeare's contemporaries took it granted that man is constantly exposed to the subversive influence demonic powers. They understood that temptation is especially ngerous in times of general disorder; that is to say, whenever the ablished order of values has been brought into question, and man, axing his humility, no longer treats as good or evil that which God s so marked out for him. In the hour of triumph or disaster, anguish d exultation easily choke man's conscience, and he, urged on by pious despair or blasphemous elation, is tempted to set up a moral ier based on human reason and desire. This is precisely the situation out in the early scenes of *Macbeth*.

The Thane meets the Weird Sisters at the very moment when, ving suppressed Macdonald's felonious rebellion, he is at the summit his glory. It is Macbeth in glory who is most liable to temptation. seems to be firmly rooted in human virtue beyond any possibility fall. He seems not to need in the least that incessant vigilance and uggle against betrayal by the Fiend. He feels rather that he has n chosen by Providence and authorized by martial victory to ablish a new order in the State. Moreover, everything apparently nfirms him in the assumption: his followers' submissive eulogies, his ng's exuberant gratitude, his own pride, his intoxication by unecedented power, and the predictions of the Witches.

Yet Hecate gives warning:

> And you all know security
> Is mortals' chiefest enemy.

e greatest peril comes from the intoxication by success, because then man's uncontrolled feelings easily unbalance his soul, dim his reason, d prevent him from subduing his will. It is the most brilliant hero o is most subject to temptation, as many parallels in the Old Testant show. This Shakespeare reflects by contrasting Banquo with acbeth. The former, not being exposed anything like so much as latter to the inebriating rays of fame, keeps his mind clear and his l in equipoise. He sees the traps laid by the demons which remain isible to his friend. But although he does not yield to temptation he ows that the satanic powers easily find any unguarded chink through ich they may break into a heedless soul, even if it has to be in the plessness of sleep. Being acquainted with human frailty, he is are that evil thoughts and wishes have often proved stronger than odwill. So he is not content to rely on his own good intentions, t prays to God for help in his weakness, lest he should succumb. It a truly moving gesture when he symbolically grasps the sword more

tightly before daring to yield himself to treacherous sleep. Th "watch and pray" element is essential in Banquo's attitude to li Christ's admonition on the Mount of Olives the poet repeated echoes in his play, even as the audience is also meant to hear fro Banquo's lips the words of the Lord's Prayer: "And lead us not in temptation, But deliver us from evil." Thus Banquo personifies Christian humbly acknowledging that even the best fall prey temptation and acquire guilt. They would be lost in eternal punis ment were it not for God's gracious aid.

By contrast, Macbeth's fall mirrors the original Fall from Paradis Let me say again that in the beginning the Thane appears to be on moral plane which it is given few to attain. Even at the most perilo moments of his temptation, the demons can take advantage of on one passion in him, and it is a passion that he has hitherto restrain instinctively and, in fact, has never been aware of, although it has be observed already by his wife. I mean: his ambition. The ambiti is not evil in itself; it becomes vicious in being magnified. All Shak peare's characters have their specific weak points for temptation attack, and when they fall it is after the demons have been able penetrate those weak points. A weakness, harmless at first, then develo into a devouring passion which poisons the imagination, dulls t reason, and bends the will, till at the last a noble hero is degrad into a brutish scoundrel. In the Thane ambition is such a speci weakness.

If we trace the procedure which the Tempter is made to adopt the play, we find that it is one given in the Bible. He first tries subvert the accepted order of values: "Fair is foul and foul is fai No wonder Macbeth's very first words are: "So fair and foul a day have not seen." Under the effect of what has just happened to hi Macbeth is already morally insecure. Things and ideas are distort for him, his previous self-discipline and aloofness are relaxed, and reason, befogged by his emotions, no longer perceives the evil swar out of which the witches' predictions come up like glittering bubbl Their deceptive promise transports him. His evil desires, poisoni his imagination, soon become within his soul the allies of the demo Previously he has instinctively pondered his plans before endorsi them with his will, as we may infer from the respect which his frier show him. On the eve of the murder, however, he wrestles with mo issues till his scared conscience refuses to be responsible and to ato for what his evil desire has long determined upon. But he has yield because his power of withstanding temptation was weak from beginning. Hence the demons that have entered into his soul, distorting the truth and reason of good and evil, easily induce him trifle with his conscience, till its misgivings are finally silenced a nothing is left inside him but unbounded passion.

Very realistically Shakespeare depicts the step from evil thought evil deed—that evil deed which ultimately comes to seem the o escape from the horror of the imagination. With diabolical subtl of argument, reason persuades the ambitious Thane that to do wrong is the best way of conquering temptation. A similar ratio

deception leads him to lay whatever consequences his actions may have at the door of Fate, which he believes to be incarnated in the Three Witches who are its seers. At first, it is true, he is unwilling to assist the fulfilment of their predictions, but neither is he prepared to withstand the lure of power, still less to spurn unlawful profit. Thus he has lost his soul before he damns it in action: a dreadful example of the power of intellectual sin. This needs expressly to be stated. Macbeth is lost before he ever acts. The evil desire, nay, the slightest notion of wrongdoing, is as evil as the actual deed. Shakespeare's pen duly reflects the spirit of the Sermon on the Mount.

The story of Man's first Fall is then retold in detail. The "bastard reason"—the prying, sacrilegious understanding—ventures to interpret good and evil in defiance of God, and sets out to assuage his conscience. The wavering man, infirm of purpose, "would not play false, and yet would wrongly win." He shrinks from the consequences of evil but not from evil itself. He willingly yields to feminine persuasion, because he can then either shirk or share responsibility. He is enticed into sin by a cunning, impulsive woman, more alive than he to their purpose, who spurs him on with mocking words and veiled threats. There is not omitted—in analogy with Genesis iii, 12—the evildoer's discharge of his blame on another. Macbeth says to Banquo's Ghost: "Thou canst not say I did it." And the Father of Lies is there also, with his cunning that is not disclosed till too late. Macbeth cannot retrace his steps when he begins to "doubt the equivocation of the fiend that lies like truth."

The spiritual effects of the fall of Macbeth and his Lady are exhibited with impressive vividness. In the beginning the Thane can be regarded as impersonating what God meant man to be: he is honest, free, conscious of his limitations, proud and humble at one and the same time. His fall subverts his noble qualities into their opposites, poisons his soul, ruins his reason, soils his imagination, and sickens him by denying him sleep. Gentle Macbeth is transformed into a villain, and there is only his brave death to remind us of his early greatness. Yet even his ultimate heroic act is more like the desperate leap of the beast of prey brought to bay. Besides it is contaminated with ignoble hatred. The man Macbeth has turned into a beast, a development hinted at beforehand in the dialogue between Macbeth and his Lady:

> I dare do all that may become a man;
> Who dares do more is none.
>
> What beast was't, then?

Most dreadful of all for the playwright's contemporaries to behold was perhaps the Thane's gradual fall taking place step by step in the presence of his fully wakened consciousness condemned to forsee the end, yet powerless to resist the raging demons to whom in the decisive moment of free will the sinner opened his soul. Now his life lies under the curse of God and man. His restless conscience impels him onward from crime to crime, and degrades the once-free creature of God into the slave of sin. He is stricken with fear of punishment in this world

and in the world to come. The stings of conscience and the constant fear of retribution rouse in him pangs of remorse, but he achieves neither penance nor atonement. He goes down into the pit with an oath on his lips, doomed in time and in eternity, now clearly aware of the Devil's deceit to which he has fallen victim, and knowing that his soul, his "eternal jewel," will be given to the "common enemy of man."

His degradation of his own life as well as of life in general is supplementary punishment.

> Had I but died an hour before this chance,
> I had liv'd a blessed time; for, from this instant,
> There's nothing serious in mortality:
> All is but toys; renown and grace is dead;
> The wine of life is drawn; and the mere lees
> Is left this vault to brag of.

There are similar passages in Scenes Two and Four of Act III.

His love for his wife gradually shrivels. When he is told the queen is dead, he but exclaims: "She should have died hereafter." And he goes on:

> Out, out, brief candle!
> Life's but a walking shadow; a poor player,
> That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
> And then is heard no more: it is a tale
> Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
> Signifying nothing.

What would have grieved him before he fell has become no more than a motive of bilious rumination.

The same spiritual consequences of surrender to sin are exhibited at work upon Lady Macbeth. Her soul and mind break down under the appalling burden of combined guilt and solitude. At last she goes out like a candle.

"Blood will have blood," Macbeth says, and the play makes blood cry to heaven for vengeance, as Abel's blood called down God's wrath and judgment upon restless Cain. Once the Fall of Man implied the fall of the whole creation. The Shakespearian drama accepts this relatedness of man and the rest of creation. No wonder sinful actions put nature into disorder, and in *Macbeth* strange events accompany the commission of crime!

Lady Macduff's words in Act IV are in the spirit of the Bible:

> I have done no harm. But I remember now
> I am in this earthly world, where to do harm
> Is often laudable; to do good, sometime
> Accounted dangerous folly: why then, alas,
> Do I put up that womanly defence,
> To say I have done no harm?

The prince of this world is the Devil, and he rules as an absolute monarch. His ministers often assume masks of piety and integrity in order to ruin the frail more easily. "All things foul would wear the air of grace." The wicked outnumber by far the good: "There are liars

and swearers enough to beat the honest men and hang them up." Macduff, bowed with grief, is tempted for a moment to rise against God. The cry of the natural man, so easily understandable in the light of the terrible sufferings of mankind, rings out of his tormented soul:

> Did Heaven look on,
> And would not take their part?

More vividly than many generations of the past, we of to-day should be able to realize how a man may be tempted to arraign God at the bar. But no later than the next instant Macduff conquers this feeling.

> Sinful Macduff,
> They were all struck for thee!

He knows that men all share a common guilt, and that God can smite the sinner by smiting those who, in the eyes of men, seem innocent.

> Not for their own demerits, but for mine,
> Fell slaughter on their souls.

He endorses the words of the Psalmist: "Verily every man at his best state is altogether vanity": "Naught that I am!" And although he has been tempted for a moment to set himself against God, he comes meekly to accept the Divine will, praying for the souls of his wife and children: "Heaven rest them now!" On the other hand, Malcolm is the first to console him by hinting at the vengeance which is already being prepared in heaven. God in Shakespeare is beyond human comprehension, loving Father and angry Judge, but always just. In the first scene of Act V the doctor, when he beholds Lady Macbeth suffering so terribly from the stings of conscience, implores heaven to forgive—not only the queen but all men, including those who seem to be without sin: "God, God, forgive us all!" His compassion is a result of the experience that the curse of Adam lies alike upon all.

In *Macbeth*, as well as in other plays, Shakespeare knows that for his audience heaven and hell are realities. He takes it for granted that the soul of the unrepentant sinner will be "given to the common enemy of man" and that death "summons thee to Heaven or to Hell." But above this "earthly world" there is the grace of God the King of Kings, whose will is to be done in spite of all demonic powers. Any good that a man may perform he owes to God's grace, and those who do good are but His tools. That is why victorious Malcolm exclaims:

> This, and what needful else
> That calls upon us, by the grace of Grace,
> We will perform in measure, time, and place.

Humility before God, trust in His wisdom and fatherly mercy, consciousness of man's limitations: these are accepted in *Macbeth* as being the ultimate and loftiest things to which man may rise. Sin and grace are the pillars that carry the dome of the Shakespearian world.

Without the background of the Old Testament cosmology and the background of the good news in the New, an audience must find many

of the happenings in that world, and at any rate those depicted in *Macbeth*, unintelligible. Unless the ever-renewed struggle for human souls—the struggle to which a majority of people are now oblivious—is accepted as a vital reality, the emotional aim of *Macbeth* goes wide: the play remains objective. Yet, paradoxically, it is now, when that reality is being widely ignored, that *Macbeth* stands forth as the drama in microcosm of Western Man.

HANS BROSZINSKI.

HERSFELD.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. R. Cant is a Lecturer in Theology in the University of Durham.

Dr Bouquet is Lecturer in Comparative Religion in the University of Cambridge.

The Most Rev. Andreas Rinkel is the Old Catholic Archbishop of Utrecht.

Dr phil. Hans Broszinski is a lecturer in modern languages at the secondary school at Hersfeld, Hesse.

CORRESPONDENCE

CANON LAW IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

There is one small, but not unimportant error occurring in Mr Dunstan's article which I think should be corrected.

In commenting on the proposed Canon XXXVI, at page 335 of this month's THEOLOGY, he implicitly assumes that under this Canon the bishop and his Chancellor could declare a marriage, already dissolved by the secular court, to be null on grounds of canon law. This is not the true construction of sub-section 2 of the proposed Canon. As this stands, the bishop and Chancellor could only allow the remarriage of one or other of the parties if it were proved that, at the time of the secular divorce, there existed grounds which would have enabled the secular court to give a decree of nullity if that, instead of divorce, had been applied for, though whether only if applied for by the party applying for the divorce or by either party is not at all clear on the wording. In other words the bishop and his Chancellor could act only on *secular*, not on *canonical* grounds. It appears to be the case that not infrequently a spouse asks for divorce when there exist grounds on which he (or she) might ask for nullity: presumably because it often allows much evidence of a very personal and somewhat unpleasant nature to be avoided.

Yours, etc.,

September 20, 1947. ARTHUR T. MACMILLAN.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE FAITH. By Godfrey E. Phillips. Lutterworth Press. 10s. 6d.

The excellence of this book is partly due to the writer's combining with a wide and prolonged intimacy with missionary practice the historical and literary equipment of a scholar, partly to his own particular skill (already familiar to readers of *The Old Testament in the World Church*), and partly to the immediate relevance of its important findings.

Its purpose is to discover what is essential to the transmission of Christianity where it is in danger of being watered down or submerged. "The transmission of Christian faith and life" is, in fact, the author's definition of our missionary purpose; and it is one of the merits of the book that evangelism is seen in such a comprehensive light.

The plan of the book is simple, and the style so lucid and easy that the reader finds his way without difficulty over the vast field. After an introductory chapter, the methods of transmission in the past begin to be reviewed in short, business-like chapters. There are three on the Hebrews and Judaism, and two on the New Testament period (account being taken here of the recent work of Carrington and Selwyn on primitive forms of catechesis lying behind the documents). Then comes a bridge-chapter, "Did the Church 'Sag Down' after the Apostles?", establishing that, actually, the general level of the Christian Church was higher, not lower, after New Testament days—the "sag" being rather in respect of the outstanding leaders than of the Church as a whole. Inevitably, in this interesting chapter, Campbell Moody is mentioned, as a distinguished student of the "sag" idea, and one wishes that there had been space for further discussion. There follow three chapters on representative periods—Justin to Augustine, The Middle Ages, and Early Modern Missions. A chapter called "Some Results of this Survey" collects the findings thus far. Then come three chapters devoted primarily to three particular aspects of "transmission," each illustrated by data from the area which is calculated to clarify it best. The maintenance of Christian standards of marriage is discussed with an African backgound; China affords the setting for a discussion of the dangers of ethics without theology; and India for the problems of mass-conversion and nominal Christianity. The data for this section of the book are drawn from the answers of a large number of missionaries to a specially prepared series of questions which is given as an appendix; and the analysis and interpretation of such a mass of documents constitutes in itself a vast and laborious contribution to missionary research. Finally the findings are applied to the mission-field of England, with an apologetic diffidence which most readers will feel to be unnecessarily modest.

And what are the main findings? One is that a Christian community disintegrates without sound instruction in the gospel story and its antecedents—the great historical facts of God's saving work,

embodied in the Old and New Testaments. Conversely, a community life is essential to the transmission of the saving history. The Christian Year, the catechism, and the creed—all these are important means for transmitting the facts to succeeding generations; and it is interesting to find the method of learning by heart given a very respectful hearing and certain aspects of such formal instruction as has been practised in Roman missions accorded sympathetic treatment. The great stress on really effective catechesis is the keynote of this book. Again, the enormous influence of Christian schools is demonstrated, and the urgency of some equivalent, where they are not forthcoming, is driven home. Similarly, Christian home-life is obviously another essential feature in "transmission." One of the most thought-provoking findings is that a Christian ought to be readily discernible as such in any society.

Apart from fascinating novelties in detail, there is nothing particularly new in all this; but it is immensely urgent and important, and carries the weight of well-documented evidence. The essentially historical basis of the gospel and the fundamentally corporate nature of Christian life are confirmed up to the hilt, with the depth of centuries and the breadth of continents, and are shown to be essential to the pastoral situation anywhere.

C. F. D. Moule.

Clare College,
Cambridge.

Morals and the New Theology. By H. D. Lewis. Gollancz. 7s. 6d.

This is a lively presentation in contemporary terms of the historic charge that orthodox theology violates an essential principle of ethics in the doctrine of Original Sin. Mr Lewis cites in particular the professors of Protestant paradox, Barth, Brunner and Reinhold Niebuhr, as the best evidence of his thesis, for in them the traditional theology has worked itself out logically and plainly; but the book is in fact an attack on the Pauline gospel and all its exponents, and an Anglican (the late Dr Quick) is allotted six severe pages of criticism. The author follows G. E. Moore in maintaining that duties are objective and that they are not best described as demands made upon us by God (p. 22 *f.*), for they commend themselves quite independently of any extraneous metaphysical support; and it is in the true interest of religion that this should be recognized (p. 157).

In one respect theologians resemble the naturalists, and Mr Lewis distrusts both for that reason: they do not admit the distinctive character of duty. They are inclined to argue that man cannot know by his own resources what his duty is, and therefore he cannot perform it that we can only be truly good when revelation enlightens and grace assists us. "At the core of this position is the assumption that sin is essentially ethical blindness" (p. 40). This ethical blindness is commonly traced to the Fall which has confused men's insight. Sin perpetuates itself—there is a collective sinfulness. And Mr Lewis argues that we cannot have both the sinfulness of "man" and the sin of "men." Either guilt has to be incurred deliberately or it has not

in cannot be in part the choice of the individual, in part the result of ne Fall. The idea of universal sinfulness has no relevance to the onduct of individual lives, and Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures imply a complete repudiation of the moral life" (p. 71).

Because of the "murkiness" of its ethical teaching, the more imbued Church is with the New Theology the more it may be associated with olitical reaction—as was the case with the German Confessional hurch, which resisted only when its freedom to preach justification vas imperilled.

This vigorous attack will not go unread by people concerned for the elfare of theology, but it is conceived perhaps on too small a canvas o be convincing, since the whole Christian scheme of Redemption, stification and Sanctification is involved, and one problem cannot e treated in isolation. Thus Mr Lewis's not unjustified contempt for a ertain kind of excessively pessimistic anthropology is not necessarily alid against an integrated Christian orthodoxy. And it is audacious r one who seizes with bitter hostility on thirteen words of Schleier-acher to claim that his principles are in "very close accord with he main trend of liberal theology." What Schleiermacher does in he second part of *The Christian Faith* is to reject the traditional doctrine f Original Sin and offer a reinterpretation; and Ritschl too, who ondemns the doctrine as vehemently as Mr Lewis, has his "Kingdom f Sin" in the common guilt of which all in some sense participate. Mr Lewis however simply rejects, and censures liberals who have pre-erved remnants of traditionalism. He never tells us why men do sin niversally.

It was unkind after building so much on a few of the early pages of *The Divine Imperative* not to use it to qualify his onslaught on Protestant bsequiousness to the State. And it is a pity there is no allusion to he work of Professor John Baillie.

WILFRID BROWNING.

HAWARDEN.

THE MEDIEVAL MANICHEE. By S. Runciman. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

THE RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS MIND. By George P. Fedotov. Harvard University Press. $6.00.

Mr Steven Runciman has attempted to reconstruct a history of the Dualist tradition, from Marcion and Mani to the Albigensians, around he central links, the Paulicians and the Bogomils, whom he knows hrough his intensive study of the history of Medieval Bulgaria. In Bulgaria itself he is our one authority; unfortunately his reading of Bulgarian history is inevitably affected by the limitations of his nowledge of Gnostics, Paulicians, and Cathari. His study of Gnosti-ism does not take account of recent arguments against the alleged riginal and ultimate Dualism of the religion of Zoroaster. If, as eems very probable, even this was not finally Dualist, the significance f minor divergences about the origin of Satan between Gnostic and Manichæan sects is greatly reduced; Satan or the Demiurge is lways a fallen and inferior god; and all Gnosticism is aboriginally Monarchian.

In dealing with the Paulicians, though he rejects Conybeare's conclusions, he is haunted by some of his illusions, for instance a "primitive adoptionism," which reappears even in Felix of Urgel at the western end of his field of vision. Felix may very likely have been influenced by Syrians from Bagdad who brought to Spain the traditions of Theodore of Mopsuestia and the school of Nisibis. It is drawing a very long bow to see in him a "lingering" of "certain traditions of the Early Church." Mr Runciman takes orthodox theology seriously:

> The vast superstructure . . . is not the baroque expression of the whims of a few pedants and eccentrics, but the attempt of the best brains of a great intellectual era to display all the implications of that revelation.

The trouble is that he is insufficiently informed on matters beyond Bulgaria.

He misses the connexion between the Bosnian and the Milanese uses of the word Patarini. Manichæanism was a charge constantly levelled against the supporters of clerical celibacy, where the married clergy were dominant. When the right wing of the Patarines triumphed extremists still suspected compromises with the world and the flesh. They could easily fall into Gnostic errors, even without knowledge historical or contemporary, of heresies or heresiarchs. As an historian Mr Runciman is naturally tempted to lay stress on historical continuity or geographical diffusion; but heresies have a way of conforming to type. At Byzantium the types were classified in collections of heresies from Epiphanius downwards. The Euchites who appeared in the eleventh century were recognized as Messalians, after a similar heresy in the fourth and fifth centuries. The Paulicians and Bogomils were classified as Manichæans. This is not ecclesiastical abuse, but elementary comparative religion.

In Bosnia and Bulgaria, where Mr Runciman is really useful, his history suffers from a misunderstanding of the relations between Latin Catholics and Orthodox "schismatics" in the thirteenth century. Some correctives to his interpretation of the Bogomils will be found in an article by Prince Dimitri Obolensky in the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* for October-December, 1945.[1]

Mr Fedotov, better known to English readers as Professor Fedotov from his Paris days, aims at interpreting the fusion of Byzantine Christianity with the Slavonic imagination in Russia before the Mongol invasions. The theme is a fascinating one; but the book suffers from the scattered nature of the complex material, which seems to have accumulated slowly as it grew. The most interesting information about pre-Christian Russian religion is at the end, not the beginning. The use of Slavonic in all the services, and the close contact of the married popes with their people, provide an obvious opportunity for an early fusion of folklore with revealed religion. At one place the author suggests that the development of Slavonic mythology was actually completed in Christianity. Perhaps the Slavic tribes "never

[1] VI, 4, pp. 147-69.

ad time to evolve fully their primary religious intuition of the Divine Motherhood into the completed forms of myth and cult. One thing is lmost certain: Greek Orthodox Christianity alone is not sufficient to ccount for the deep and rich forms of the Divine Womanhood cults vhich took place on the Russian soil."

Where his thesis is most definite, it suffers somewhat from this anti-Byzantine bias, characteristic of the Slavophils.

In reading the Byzantine historians one is appalled by the amount of ruelty and perfidy occurring at every step: regicides; tortures and mutilations f vanquished foes; blinding and castration not only of individuals but of hole captive armies . . . a cold, passionless cruelty which finds no moral pposition from either the narrating authors or—with rare exceptions—from ne contemporary Church.

his is certainly overstrained: the coldness and want of passion are here, but not the recklessness of human life. In Mr Fedotov's book Kenotic features in Russian religious life are ascribed to the Slavs, ood discriminations and the physiological view of ritual uncleanness o the Greeks, with insufficient justification in either case, as it seems o me. It would be a mistake to attribute all oriental and barbaric lements in Russia to the Byzantine inheritance. Other oriental nfluences came in from Persia and Bagdad, and the steppes had their aders long before the Mongol conquest. This book contains a mass f fascinating material, that must be handled with some discrimination.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

KELHAM.

A PRAYER BOOK FOR 1949. By Oscar Hardman. Part III. The Psalter and the Lectionary. 6s.

We have to thank Dr Hardman for the third and final instalment of his suggestions for further Prayer Book revision, and for the ingenuity and industry that he has lavished upon them. But greatly as we admire his careful and laborious works, we fear they will prove of little value to future revisers on account both of their academic quality, and of what one may call the survival of the "1928" mentality. What is needed (if at all) in a revision of the Psalter is an occasional amendment of the more obscure passages, possibly a very few redistributions of the Psalms, and a much better literary lay-out. In this last matter, Dr Hardman gives us much to be grateful for—clear paragraphing, indications of structure, italicizing of refrains, separate printing of the doxologies to the five books. These could be undertaken with immediate and unquestioned advantage, involving no matter of principle. But he goes much further than this, and provides an individual and scholarly vision of "The Psalter adapted for liturgical use"—including an entirely fresh translation. Even if desirable, this last would be wholly impracticable to secure—such, for good or evil, is the actual force of religious conservatism, and any considerable rearrangement of verses and conflation of Psalms, such as he suggests, would only play further havoc with the practical use of the Psalter in congregational worship.

Two more important matters emerge from his suggestions, both c which involve essentially theological issues. Dr Hardman stands b (and very slightly extends) the policy of omitting certain passage which are described as giving expression to "the spirit of vindictive ness" which "belongs to the natural man, is contrary to the law c Christ, and is of doubtful interpretation on the lips of Christian men. That policy of omissions half-heartedly undertaken by the revisers c the 1920's is seen now to require one of two decisions. *Either* it mu be carried much further, if we are to rid the Psalter of all that th modern man does not easily stomach, *or* it must be frankly aban doned in view of the recovery (gradually acquired during this la quarter century) of the traditional Christian approach to the Psalms– Biblical, theological, corporate, liturgical. And its use must be taugh accordingly. Dr Hardman favours a heading, or "descriptive title" fo each Psalm, and this has proved a valuable method of giving suc direction of thought. But the titles he offers provide only the meagres literary description, and (it would seem deliberately) ignore the co porate and Christological bearing of the Psalms. "A royal weddin song" is little help to the *Christian worshipper* in reciting Psalm 4 surely he needs something more like "The wedding-song of Christ an His Church" if he is to catch its liturgical meaning? A Prayer Boo for 1949 and beyond—if it is right for it to provide such titles—wi need to base them on theological principles of interpretation.

The proposals for the Lectionary require little comment. Th Amended Lectionary for Sundays is accepted, a considerable revisio of lessons for festival weeks provided, and the suggestion made (bu not worked out in detail) for a two-year course of "consecutive readin of the Scriptures" for the ferial weeks of the year. We venture t hope that the existing 1922 weekday Lectionary now in very wide us will not be (at any rate substantially) altered, and the weekday cours at least not thrown into the confusion of varieties now experienced o Sundays.

HENRY DE CANDOLE.

HENFIELD.

SELECTED WRITINGS. By Solomon Schechter. Edited by Norma Bentwich. East and West Library, Oxford. 1946. 10s. 6d.

KUZARI: THE BOOK OF PROOF AND ARGUMENT. By Jehuda Halev Abridged edition with Introduction and Commentary by Isaa Heinemann. East and West Library, Oxford. 1947. 8s. 6d.

These are volumes of a series entitled Philosophia Judaica now bein published by the East and West Library under the general editorshi of Professor Bergmann of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Professo Bentwich, in the foreword to his volume, expresses the design of th series as being "to give Jewish and Gentile readers a selection fro the writings of the spiritual teachers of our fathers and grandfather such as will keep their memories and influence alive." Modern a well as classical thinkers are represented amongst the first titles, a can be seen from the two now under review.

Solomon Schechter is probably best known for his share in t

iscovery and deciphering at the end of the last century of the Hebrew ISS of Ecclesiasticus. This selection from his writings shows how aried were his interests, and how widespread his influence on his ay and generation. Born 100 years ago in Roumania, he studied in ienna and Berlin before coming to England at the invitation of laude Montefiore. Here he was Reader of Rabbinics at Cambridge, nd later Goldsmid Professor of Hebrew at London University. His ast years were spent in America, where his name will always be ssociated with the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York and the nited Synagogue of America.

Professor Bentwich gives a very readable life of Schechter by way of ntroduction, whetting the reader's appetite with many quotations, ost of which occur in the following pages. A dated bibliography f Schechter's principal writings appears at the end. Professor entwich arranges his selection under four heads, Studies in Judaism, istorical Studies, American Addresses, and Travel Letters, and the est compliment that can be paid the selector is to say that he makes he reader impatient to delve deeper into Schechter's writings in their ller form. With this in mind one wishes that the present selection ad been supplied with exact indications of source and date, so that he reader might the more easily refer to the original. Sometimes too, ne feels that so much of an essay has been left out in making the lection that the original title no longer really applies.

It is very tempting to quote, but lack of space forbids. Suffice it to ay that here will be found much of interest and value to Christian s well as to Jewish readers, much truth expressed with caustic wit nd humour, and very much that is up-to-date in its reference to the eed of the world for a living faith.

Jehuda Halevi is less likely to be well known outside scholastic rcles, but he too, as this book shows, has much to contribute to the nlightenment and settlement of modern man. Isaak Heinemann, ometime Professor of Hellenistic Civilization at the University of reslau, and now at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, supplies an ntroduction and a Commentary to the present work, an abridged dition of the twelfth-century "Kuzari." He expresses the hope that he reader will not shirk the study of the original, but as this is in rabic, the general reader will feel the more indebted to the present nd other editions in translation.

The Kuzari is said to be "the only genuine dialogue in Jewish hilosophy of the Middle Ages." Its subtitle "An apology for a espised religion" indicates the main burden of the work, which is o provide a defence of Judaism in terms of current philosophy. he main characters of the discussion are a Rabbi and an eighth-entury king of the Khazars, who ultimately, after a consideration f different beliefs and religions, becomes a convert to Judaism.

The fact that the Introduction, as well as the main work, is a trans-ation, no doubt accounts for the use of certain unusual word forms, specially in proper names (*e.g.*, Jesaiah, Eliah, Jeremia, Moslemin). ut this is a small point, and can easily be rectified in subsequent ditions. In general, both these volumes, well printed and attractively

bound, would seem to be a welcome addition to any library, a goo advertisement for the series as a whole, and, more important still, definite contribution to Jewish-Christian understanding.

St George's Close, Jerusalem. C. Witton-Davies.

Die Römisch-Katholische Kirche: Eine Einführung und Quellen sammlung. By Kurt Guggisberg. Zwingli-Verlag. 15 fr. 50.

This volume is designed as a source-book for the study of Papa claims. Some 200 pages are devoted to extracts from original docu ments arranged to illustrate the distinguishing doctrines of the Roma Church, while the first 146 pages contain the author's introductor comment on the significance of the excerpts. Professor Guggisberg Berne University has produced the book at the request of "der Schwe zerische Protestantische Volksbund" which felt that there was a nee for a systematic and serious survey in the German language whic would provide in convenient form official Roman teaching for th theological student and the intelligent layman.

The plan and the manner of publication of the work leave nothin to be desired. As a reference book, it will be generally useful for th student of Church history as well as for those who wish to verif isolated points of fact and interpretation in this subject. The admirabl table of contents enables the reader of the introductory commen to refer speedily to the original sources. The specialist, of course, i the English-speaking world will hardly find it so useful. The book is nc intended for those who can read the Latin of Denzinger's Enchiridio nor for those who have ready access to the Library of the Fathers.

There is, however, contained in the introduction much indirec information concerning the theological outlook of the Swiss Protestant modern continental methods of controversy, and the general Pro testant estimate of the influence and position of the Papacy in Switzer land. It is abundantly clear that there is a stiff conflict between th Catholic and the Reformed at the present time, when the populatio of the country is evenly divided between the two traditions. Th author's anti-papal arguments run, for the most part, on familia lines, but it must be admitted that there is a measure of vaguenes in his positive presentation of reformed doctrine. The Anglican wi find that Dr Guggisberg has whittled away much of the doctrine the Church, the Sacraments and the Ministry in his trenchant criticisn of the Roman teaching on these subjects. However, the tone of h polemic is always dignified and restrained. Where he introduce controversy, he breathes charity. He also gives due recognition t many commendable features in the Roman system. For example, h praises the revival of Biblical study and wishes that the Protestan might emulate the efforts of the promoters of the Liturgical movemen in encouraging the laity to play a more active part in the Church life.

Some quotations will reveal the author's attitude towards Catholicit and the form of the Church. "The Catholic," he writes, "has far mo inherited religion that the extreme Protestant . . . When Paul speal

of the unity of Faith and Baptism, he is thinking of a spiritual, not an externally organized, unity." He solves the problem of the Church paradoxically: "the Church is visible and invisible at the same time." In rejecting the proposal for "Christian unity at any price," he lauds the quality of variety in Protestantism, a feature which he complains that many Protestants fail to appreciate. In his eyes, the individual has been rescued from spiritual tyranny by Hegel and Schleiermacher. At this point in his argument, when he wishes to demonstrate the Roman principle of subjection to authority, it hardly seems fair to quote George Tyrrell's *Between Scylla and Charybdis*. He laments that there is no official Roman definition of the nature of the Church and quotes various modern writers to show that in their attempt to define they all differ from one another, yet he does not refer to the encyclical "Mystici corporis" (1943) which treats this very subject with detail and authority.

While his appeal to the Fathers is extensive, it is not always discriminating. There seems little to be gained by quoting from the *de pudicitia* of Tertullian to denigrate Petrine claims and the Catholic doctrine of Absolution, since Tertullian had already turned Montanist when he wrote this work.

The author's comments on the influence of Roman Catholicism in the Switzerland of to-day are full of interest. The pressure groups of Catholic Action and the Society of Jesus seem to him to cause the most serious threat to true religion. Catholic Action has been vigorous in Switzerland on account of the scarcity of candidates for the priesthood. Through this agency, Roman Catholics have been filtering unobserved into Protestant areas. Switzerland is confessionally neutral, but Catholicism "ist ausgepraegter Konfessionalismus." Only in a very reserved manner is credit given to the Romanist attack on Naziism. On the subject of the Jesuits, Dr Guggisberg waxes eloquent. He describes them as intolerant and unsurpassed in the praise of their own achievements. The results of these influences for the educational policy of the country he considers deplorable. He points to the much more satisfactory condition of things in Belgium, where the Church has a strong influence over State schools, and yet at the same time there are many private schools which benefit from State grants.

George Simms.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

The Early History of the Liturgy. By J. H. Srawley. 2nd Edition. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

1913, the year of the first edition, is a while ago. It is good that at the end of his days as chancellor of Lincoln minster Dr Srawley should have been led to revise this very valuable handbook on the growth and content of the eucharistic rite and customs during the first four hundred years. It is not only students at universities and theological colleges who will bless him for this fruit of his great learning in the careful precise tradition of Cambridge scholarship. Others will be glad to have this sheaf of 240 pages on their shelves. It will be prized as a trusty guide, esteemed for its many references to patristic

texts, to the great dictionaries, and to periodicals. To take up these demands ability to read the French and German, as well as the Greek and Latin tongues. To the liturgist seeking land amidst seas of speculation it will be a joy to have so comprehensive a review of the salient points in the early period. The divine office is but beginning to exist, in this early period; the examination is of the emergence of the eucharistic norms of the patristic age. Here will be found exact judgments, nice discernments in these matters. This neat, severe volume is for students, for students only, for sitters upon wooden stools, not for loungers in easy chairs desirous of pleasantly acquiring acquaintance with the dicta of the diligent, bright-witted excavators of ancient Christian rituals.

Dr Srawley has had friendship with Edmund Bishop and Hugh Connolly. This new edition owes much to the publications of the latter, and correspondence with him during the Hitlerian war has led both to accept the Ambrosian authorship of the de Sacramentis: "The book contains the actual words of the addresses of Ambrose to the newly-baptized taken down at the time by a notarius . . . While de Mysteriis is a single treatise, a recast of lectures given, de Sacramentis is an actual full report of the addresses. These addresses can only have been published after the death of Ambrose, as alike in de Mysteriis and in other writings he still recognizes the existence of the disciplina arcani" (p. 155). It is something to have this settled. The problem of the Liber ad baptizandos by Theodore of Mopsuestia (died 428 A.D.) is not gone into; would that it had been. In 1933 A. Mingana published the part that deals with the eucharist as volume VI of his Woodbrooke Studies. Though this is probably the most important of the texts unearthed by Mingana that have as yet been published, the *Journal of Theological Studies* for some reason or for no reason did not review it. Mingana does not tell us where he found the manuscript of this hitherto lost work of Theodore. He does not tell us the date of his manuscript. It is a Syriac translation of Theodore's Greek. What he does say is this, "as the manuscript is not throughout in a good state of preservation and is in many places wormed and damaged by damp, it was not found desirable to reproduce it in facsimile. For this reason I have had to copy all its text and edit it in the ordinary Syriac type instead of following the usual practice in my Woodbrooke Studies of giving facsimiles in the case of unique texts." Yet his Syriac text as printed is never in doubt about the original it is reproducing, and his translation runs smoothly without emendations, guesses, lacunæ, etc. H. W. Codrington (*J.T.S.*, vol. 39, p. 145) translates a passage for himself from the Syriac. But G. Dix in *The Shape of the Liturgy* uses the English of Mingana frequently and without reserve. Surely it is time some Syriac-reading liturgist examined Mingana's manuscript at Selly Oak, and told us how reliable Mingana's transcript and translation are, discussed the character of the Syriac translation of Theodore's Greek, and the question of whether later modification is to be detected in some places.

Again, in Dr Srawley's handbook two pressing problems are rather cold shouldered. It would be good to know if we should be happy or

very cautious about Cirlot's and Dix's exposition of the eucharistic bread and cup in connexion with the grace-loaf and loving-cup of solemn Jewish meals. Then, Dr Srawley, I take it, puts to one side Dix's theory of the origin of the Sanctus in Alexandria before 200 A.D., kindly and gently, almost ignoring it as he does many of Dix's interesting suggestions, for on p. 128 the new edition continues to note a possible reference to the Sanctus in the North African Acts of Perpetua, 203 A.D. It may well be Dix's positions have to be very carefully gone into, but I do not think they are as yet met or disposed of.

Finally, I use the reviewer's privilege to note slight inaccuracies even in what he venerates. On p. ix it is said Theodore uses "liturgy" of the eucharist, but indeed the word in the passage discussed is applied not to the whole eucharistic rite but only to the eucharistic prayer called in Theodore of Mopsuestia "anaphora."

That Dr Srawley bequeaths this book to us in a form more consonant with his matured judgments than the long out of print edition of 1913 is cause for much thankfulness. Many will rise up from the study of it to say with those who know him, revere him, and have been his pupils, Deo Gratias.

ROBERT P. SYMONDS.

THE BISHOP'S HOSTEL,
LINCOLN.

THE CLERGY AND MARRIAGE OF THE DIVORCED. By G. L. H. Harvey. Modern Churchman's Union. 1s. 3d.

The object of this pamphlet is to resolve the contradiction between the Herbert Act and the Canon Law of the Church of England by saying that the contradiction does not, or ought not to, exist. The argument is that the Church has from the beginning accepted the Matthæan exception; that Western tradition, while in theory rejecting the exception, admitted it and many more by a liberal use of decrees of nullity and dispensation; that the Herbert Act of 1937 is nearer to the rule of the Gospel than the unrelaxed Western tradition reaffirmed by Convocation Resolutions; and that these, and episcopal injunctions based upon them, have no binding force upon the clergy, but are rather unlawful attempts to deprive incumbents of a discretion which is legally theirs. Whatever truth there is in these contentions, it will gain little acceptance from this particular piece of advocacy. When Mr Harvey has dealt first with the Convocations, the Assembly and the bishops, and then with the interpretation of the New Testament, we may well wonder what authority beyond a changing statute law is left. Three misquotations, one of them grave, on his first page of Scriptural citation (p. 12) do not inspire confidence in his exegesis, which, in fact, proves to be shallow and self-contradictory indeed. All the Lord's "sayings" upon marriage and divorce—except, of course, *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*—are reduced to the same level as the other "ethical ideals" of the Sermon on the Mount; the case built on the Matthæan exception (the doubtful authenticity of which is twice admitted) would have some solidity if Matthew had written *μοιχεία*; but he wrote *πορνεία*, and that word opens many possibilities; the important

contrast between our Lord's prescription and Moses' law is entirely removed by the suppression of that part of the Marcan dialogue and the "but I say unto you" verse in Matthew (Mk. x, 3-5; Matt. v, 31; pp. 12, 15); the re-affirmation given privately in the house is dismissed with "such utterances in private are not thought to be as authentic as public utterances" (p. 13. We should like to have Mr Harvey's answer to Professor Manson's *The Teaching of Jesus*); and, whether by design or careless writing, the Pauline privilege is smoothly extended from the departure of the unbeliever to simple desertion. The chapter on the Tradition of the Church of England is better; it is a proper course to search our divines for a tradition of interpretation of the disputed texts; but Mr Harvey should give his references: it is not enough to quote *e.g.*, Archbishop Frederick Temple for the opinion that "The Book of Common Prayer does not pronounce marriage indissoluble" without a page reference and without amplification. A treatment of The Law and Marriage which opens with a manifest confusion of the terms Civil Law and civil courts (p. 25) does not promise well; and the author's attitude to the Law of the Church, and to the consciences of clergymen who feel bound to obey it, is expressed in his sentence "A more questionable feature of the Herbert Act was that it deprived the successful petitioner, who later wished to marry again, of the previous uncontrovertible right to marriage in church" (p. 30). There are signs that the Church of England is awake to the need of tempering the absolute rigour of its law to meet cases of genuine hardship and inequity, without undermining the authority of the law itself; but that work will not be furthered by an advocacy which does not suffer a reasoned contrary opinion to exist. Nevertheless, it remains true that discretion is vested by the law of the land in the parish priest for giving or withholding his ministrations or his church, and that he too is responsible in law if he repels from the Communion divorced persons who have remarried. The ruling of his bishop can give him moral support, but no more.

G. R. Dunstan.

Hawarden.

SHORTER NOTICES

This Life and the Next. By P. T. Forsyth. Independent Press. 5s.

This was the last to be written, and is the first to be republished of Forsyth's books. It appeared in 1918, and it comes now to speak its message to another post-war generation of Christians. The sub-title, "The effect on this life of faith in another," defines its scope. The Christian hope of eternal life is not seen in its full splendour until it too is moralized, and shown to be a vivifying and illuminating influence in this life. It rests not on any natural immortality of the soul (which Forsyth does not deny) but on a personal relationship with God in Christ. It is no mere egoistic expectation of reward, for immortality is the work of God, of grace and undeserved; yet it enhances the value of the human personality, and gives meaning to life as well

s to death, for "grace is nature's destiny." The arch of regeneration inds the two worlds together and overspans the gulf of death.

Forsyth is writing to fortify believers and not to defend the Christian elief against criticism. Occasionally he lets fall a remark in passing which reveals that limitation of understanding which Nonconformity eems to impose on even her finest minds. But this is more than ompensated for by the frequent flashes of insight which manifest to us that we are dealing with a master theologian writing a noble book.

R. CANT.

DURHAM.

The Rise of Christianity. By E. W. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham. Longmans. 15s.

The scholar who was invited to review this book informs us that after carefully examining it he does not wish to submit any comment on it for publication in THEOLOGY. It is now very late in the day to invite another reviewer. If we saw grounds for supposing the book to be an important contribution to theological scholarship, we should take further steps to get it reviewed in THEOLOGY. To those who wish to know why the book cannot be so regarded, we would commend the reviews of it in *The Modern Churchman* for July, 1947, by the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, and in Professor C. H. Dodd's pamphlet *Christian Beginnings* published by the Epworth Press.

On October 15th, 1947, I was spending the night at a well-known theological seminary in the U.S.A., and in the course of conversation it happened to emerge that my hosts, who follow theological publications in England with keen interest, had not even heard of this book by the Bishop of Birmingham. I adverted to the fact that the English ecclesiastical authorities had wisely refrained from taking any action about it since, I presumed, they realized that the only effect of doing so would be to give it a publicity it could not otherwise enjoy. I was therefore disconcerted the next morning at breakfast to find the announcement on the front page of *The New York Times* that the Archbishop of Canterbury had just condemned the book, and consequently given it a magnificent free advertisement in the U.S.A.

A. R. VIDLER.

NEW YORK.

INDEX TO VOLUME L

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1947

PAGE

ABBA, R. 5
Anglican Episcopate, 1780-1945, The 20
Apostolic Ministry, The 82, 13
Archbishop and Reunion, The 29
Archbishop Ussher's Scheme of Church Government 9
Artificial Insemination of Livestock, The 13
Baptism and the Catechumenate 12
Being and Having 37
BELGION, M. 9
BENNETT, F. 4
BENTLEY, G. B. 18
BERWICK, G. T. 16
BLOMFIELD, H. G. 12
BLOW, N. J. 17
BOLTON, F. R. 9, 37

BOOKS REVIEWED:

Barker, *The Way of Life* (W. R. F. Browning) 18
Béguin, *Léon Bloy* (M. Belgion) 23
Bell, *The Altar and the World* (M. A. C. Warren) 11
Bell, *The Church and Humanity* (C. E. Hudson) 15
Black, *An Aramaic Approach* (H. Danby) 18
Brandreth, *The Œcumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement* (C. P. S. Clarke) 43
Brewin and Johnson, *The Renewal of Democracy* (R. G. Lunt) 35
Brodrick, *The Progress of the Jesuits* (T. M. Parker) 15
Buber, *Moses* (H. H. Rowley) 31
Cabasilas, *Explication de la Divine Liturgie* (G. Every) 7
Camfield (Ed.), *Reformation Old and New* (C. W. Quin) 34
Carpenter, *A Paraphrase of the Epistle to the Philippians* (C. F. Evans) . 39
Chadwick, *The Inner Life* (R. Cant) 22
Cirlot, *Apostolic Succession and Anglicanism* (J. P. Hickinbotham) . . 26
Cleobury, *God, Man and the Absolute* (B. S. Moss) 39
Cullman, *Christus und die Zeit* (W. A. Whitehouse) 23
Cunliffe-Jones, *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation* (A. M. Farrer) . 35
Curtis, *William of Glasshampton* (E. D. Tyndall) 23
Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 26
D'Eypernon, *Le Mystère Primordial* (H. Balmforth) 15
Dillistone, *The Holy Spirit* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 19
Dodd, *The Bible To-day* (H. H. Rowley) 11
Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles* (W. Manson) 2
Edwards, *Jesus: the Gospel Portrait* (E. R. Lewis) 42
Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate* (M. Pierce) 39
Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind* (G. Every) 46
Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (R. Cant) 31
Friedman, *The Redemption of Isreal* (C. Witton-Davies) 43
Garbett, *The Claims of the Church of England* (F. Bennett) 38
Ghellinck, *L'Essor de la Littérature Latine* (F. J. E. Raby) . . . 6
Ghéon, *The Secret of St. Martin* (A. A. Cock) 19
God's Will for Church and Nation (R. G. Lunt) 35
Grant, *Second-Century Christianity* (H. E. W. Turner) 3
Guggisberg: *Die Römisch-Katholische Kirche* (G. Simms) 47
Halevi, *Kuzari: The Book of Proof and Argument* (C. Witton-Davies) . . 47
Halevy, *Péguy and Les Cahiers de la Quinzaine* (M. Belgion) . . . 3
Hanson, *Your Reasonable Service* (M. A. C. Warren) 11
Hardman, *A Prayer Book for* 1949 (Parts I and II) (R. P. Symonds) . . 19
Hardman, *A Prayer Book for* 1949 (Part III) (H. de Candole) . . . 46
Harvey, *The Clergy and Marriage of the Divorced* (G. R. Dunstan) . . 47
Herklots, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (C. F. Evans) 39
Herman, *The Rebirth of the German Church* (W. W. S. March) . . . 11
Hood, *Icelandic Church Saga* (M. C. Bradbrook) 15
Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (M. Belgion) . . . 11

PAGE
Hughes, *A History of the Church* (G. R. Dunstan) 198
Hutton, *Caste in India* (C. S. Milford) 193
Jenkins, *The Gift of Ministry* (M. Jarrett-Kerr) 346
Johnson, *A Treatise on Language* (M. Belgion) 318
Kilpatrick, *The Origin of the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (R. V. G. Tasker) 113
Leeson, *Christian Education* (Bishop of Bristol) 427
Lewis, C. S., *Miracles* (A. C. Scupholme) 395
Lewis, H. D., *Morals and the New Theology* (W. R. F. Browning) . . 466
Lloyd, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century* (N. Sykes) . . 30
Luther Speaks (J. Marsh) 394
Manley (Ed.) *The New Bible Handbook* (E. R. Lewis) 429
Marshall, *The Challenge of New Testament Ethics* (W. R. F. Browning) . 188
Martin (Ed.), *The Holy Communion* (F. W. Camfield) 397
Mascall, *Christ, the Christian and the Church* (N. J. Blow) 148
Mauriac, *A Woman of the Pharisees* (A. Sampson) 34
Miller, *Christian Vocation in the Contemporary World* (J. A. T. Robinson) . 436
Muller, *Christians and Pagans* (H. E. W. Turner) 36
Parker, *The Oracles of God* (D. T. Jenkins) 270
Payne, *Henry Wheeler Robinson* (L. W. Grensted) 157
Peck, *Glad in Him with Psalms* (C. S. Phillips) 435
Peers, *The Complete Works of St Teresa* (F. P. Harton) 146
Pepper, *A Digest of Purposive Values* (M. Belgion) 318
Phillips, *The Transmission of the Faith* (C. F. D. Moule) 465
Pittenger, *His Body the Church* (N. J. Blow) 148
Ransom, *The Christian Minister in India* (L. M. Schiff) 158
Robertson, *Contrasts* (J. H. L. Waterson) 235
Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation* (R. P. C. Hanson) 28
Rowley, *The Rediscovery of the Old Testament* (N. W. Porteous) . . . 229
Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (G. Every) 467
Schechter, *Selected Writings* (C. Witton-Davies) 470
Sencourt, *The Consecration of Genius* (A. Sampson) 194
Sheed, *Theology and Sanity* (M. Jarrett-Kerr) 232
Shorter Prayer Book (F. Bennett) 433
Should Democracy Survive? (C. E. Hudson) 153
South India Church Scheme (Bishop of Southampton) 109
Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy* (R. P. Symonds) . . . 473
Sutcliffe, *The Old Testament and the Future Life* (H. H. Rowley) . . 156
Tasker, *The Old Testament in the New Testament* (A. M. Farrer) . . 351
Tate, *The Parish Chest* (G. R. Dunstan) 71
Taylor, *Into Thy Courts* (C. S. Phillips) 435
Taylor, *The Church of God* (R. Cant) 228
Taylor, *The Groundwork of the Gospels* (J. D. M. Stuart) 352
Tuckey, *Building New Orders* (D. G. S. Upton) 434
Wand, *The New Testament Letters* (R. H. Fuller) 27
Ward, *The Splendour of the Rosary* (F. P. Harton) 35
Watson, *The State as the Servant of God* (E. G. Rupp) 73
Williams, *The Anglican Tradition* (F. Bennett) 388
Williamson, *An Anatomy of Christian Joy* (G. Seaver) 195
Wright, *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* (H. H. Rowley) 112

BUQUET, A. C. 447
COSZINSKI, H. 458
sh Brotherhood, The Birth of 163
ll to Christian Action in Public Affairs, A 91
ANDOLE, H. DE 172, 215
ANT, R. 441
non Law in the Church of England 283, 324
rist the Healer 243
ristian Reality in "Macbeth" 458
ristian Understanding of History, The 53
ristianity, Church, Sacrament 363, 418, 454
LLINS, L. J. 91
RRESPONDENCE 24, 68, 107, 265, 310, 384, 464

PA
COWLEY, P. 25
CUNLIFFE-JONES, H. 25
DAVIES, J. G. 4
Disintegration of the Christian Initiation Rite, The 4
DUNSTAN, G. R. 283, 3
Eighteenth-Century Anglican Divine, The 25
Eliot's "Family Reunion," Mr 5
ELLIOTT-BINNS, L. E. 34
Episcopal Church in Scotland, The 44
Est autem Fortuna? 33
Expository Preaching 25
GRAVE, S. A. 25
GREENSLADE, S. L. 82, 1
HANSON, R. P. C. 14
HEREFORD, BISHOP OF 2
HUTCHINSON, F. E. 4
Is the Term "Captivity Epistles" Justified? 3
JARRETT-KERR, M. 3
JENKINS, C. 1
JENKINS, D. T. 2
Kittel, The Case of Gerhard 4
LEWIS, E. R. 1
London Christian of Tudor Times, A 4
MCDOWELL, R. B. 2
Mersch, The Last Work of Émile 1
Money or Men . . . . . .
MOSS, B. S. . . . . .
Natural Theology 1
OULTON, J. E. L. . . . . .
Parables as Literature, The . . . . . .
Passion Without Grace 3
PHILLIPS, G. L. 2
POORE, L. A. 3
PORTER, J. R. 4
Prayers for the King 2
QUIN, C. W. 1
ROBINSON, J. A. T. . . . . .
SAMPSON, A. . . . . .
SCHOMERUS, H. 1
SCUPHOLME, A. C. . . . . .
Second-Century Teaching on Holy Baptism . . . . . .
Shakespearian Pattern, The 2
Shorter Notices 38, 75, 119, 159, 236, 271, 354, 339, 437, 4
SMITH, R. G. . . . . .
Studies in Texts 105, 142, 2
SYNGE, F. C. 2
Temptation, The . . . . . .
THIELICKE, H. . . . . .
Thinking Anew 1
Towards the Conversion of France . . . . . .
Use of the Psalms To-day, The 172, 2
UTRECHT, ARCHBISHOP OF 363, 418, 4
Village Gossip . . . . . .
WALTON, G. N. . . . . .
WEDELL, H. . . . . .
"Why you should read it" 20, 64, 138, 182, 342, 379, 4
WOODS, G. F. 2
Work and the Workers, The . . . . . .
Works of Thy Hands, The . . . . . .
WRIGHT, W. S. T. 2

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher